

are defined as being different, this directly contradicts what Denning said must be done. In claim 1, the second object is used with the first client in place of the first object without recompiling.

As well as applicant's attorney can tell, none of the references have anything to do with such versioning. Thus, they do not use a second object in place of a first object. They are not snapping in a second object to replace a prior object, achieving binary compatibility while using different identifiers, contrary to the teaching of Denning.

Christensen just teaches a remote access system. It is true that Christensen says he can implement this system without recompiling, but Christensen is not substituting one object for another either permanently or selectively. Therefore, the fact that Christensen can do what Christensen does without recompiling is of no particular pertinency to the present application.

While it is contended that somehow Christensen inherently includes using the second object in place of the first object, it is not seen why this is so. Christensen simply uses different objects for different purposes. He is not trying to do any kind of versioning.

With respect to claim 6 even if in fact Christensen does register more than one object, he does not selectively access one of the first and second objects and use it in place of the other as now recited in amended claim 6.

In view of these remarks, the application is now in condition for allowance and the Examiner's prompt action in accordance therewith is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 6/29/99

  
Timothy N. Trop  
Reg. No. 28,994  
TROP, PRUNER, HU & MILES, P.C.  
8554 Katy Freeway, Ste. 100  
Houston, TX 77024  
713/468-8880 [Phone]  
713/468-8883 [Fax]